

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/590,850	08/25/2006	Kazuhiko Fujisawa	21089/0207151-US0	3799	
- "	7590 09/24/2007 RRY P C		EXAMINER		
DARBY & DARBY P.C. P.O. BOX 770			CHO, JENNIFER Y		
Church Street S New York, NY		•	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
·			1621		
		•			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			09/24/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

•		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/590,850	FUJISAWA ET AL.			
Office Action	Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	•	Jennifer Y. Cho	1621			
The MAILING DATE Period for Reply	of this communication	appears on the cover shee	t with the correspondence add	ress		
WHICHEVER IS LONGER - Extensions of time may be available after SIX (6) MONTHS from the may be available after SIX (6)	R, FROM THE MAILING le under the provisions of 37 CFR ailing date of this communication. above, the maximum statutory per stended period for reply will, by stater than three months after the ma	DATE OF THIS COMMUSE 1.136(a). In no event, however, maind will apply and will expire SIX (6)	ay a reply be timely filed MONTHS from the mailing date of this con he ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1) Responsive to comm	nunication(s) filed on <u>25</u>	5 August 2006.				
2a) This action is FINAL		his action is non-final.	•			
3) Since this application	☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance	e with the practice unde	er Ex parte Quayle, 1935	C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	•		
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-6</u> is/are p	pending in the application	n.				
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	•	drawn from consideration.		•		
5) Claim(s) is/a				·		
6) Claim(s) is/a			•			
7) Claim(s) is/a						
8) Claim(s) <u>1-6</u> are sul	-	r election requirement.				
Application Papers			•			
	abia stad ta bu tha Evan	.inar	•			
9) ☐ The specification is (10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed	•		to by the Examiner			
			eyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	•		
			wing(s) is objected to. See 37 CF	R 1.121(d).		
· -			ched Office Action or form PT			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1	19		-			
12) Acknowledgment is	made of a claim for fore	eign priority under 35 U.S.	C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).			
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some *	c) None of:					
1. Certified copi	es of the priority docum	ents have been received.		·		
•			in Application No			
3. Copies of the	certified copies of the p	oriority documents have b	een received in this National S	Stage		
· •		reau (PCT Rule 17.2 <u>(</u> a)).				
* See the attached det	ailed Office action for a	list of the certified copies	not received.			
Attachment(s)	•					
1) Notice of References Cited (P	TO-892)	• ——	riew Summary (PTO-413)			
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Pater	nt Drawing Review (PTO-948	/ — ·	r No(s)/Mail Date e of Informal Patent Application			
 Information Disclosure Statem Paper No(s)/Mail Date 		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	:			

Art Unit: 1621

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-2, drawn to a process for producing a silicone compound, classified in class 556, subclass 440.
- II. Claims 3-6, drawn to a silicone compound, classified in class 556, subclass 440.

Groups I and II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). The product of Group II can be made by other methods, as shown in the reference: Joseph et al. (US 4,602,078).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims.

Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the

Art Unit: 1621 /

requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

- (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;
 - (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;
 - (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);

Art Unit: 1621

(d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;

(e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete <u>must</u> include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable

Art Unit: 1621

over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

A telephone call was made to Adam Keser on 7/24/07 at 703-760-7700 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jennifer Y. Cho whose telephone number is (571) 272 6246. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 AM - 6 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yvonne Eyler can be reached on (571) 272-0646. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1621

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jennifer Cho Patent Examiner Art Unit: 1621

Yvonne Eyler

Supervisory Patent Examiner Technology Center 1621